GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION
LOK SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO:5930
ANSWERED ON:31.08.2001
LONG TERM FOOD GRAIN POLICY
SUBODH MOHITE

Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

(a) whether a high-level Committee on formulating a long-term foodgrain policy has recommended the exemption of Food Corporation of India from paying statutory levies to State Government;

(b) if so, the reaction of the Union Government thereto;

(c) whether the Government have examined the interim report submitted by Prof. Abhijit Sen on said subject;

(d) if so, the main recommendations made in the report; and

(e) the time by which long-term food grain policy is likely to be finalised?

Answer

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (SHRI CHAUHAN)

(a): Yes, Sir.

(b): This recommendation is under examination of Government of India.

(c): The interim report is under examination of Government of India.

(d): The main recommendations of the high-level committee in its interim report are at Annexure.

(e): The high-level committee is expected to submit its report to Government by the end of September, 2001.
ANNEXURE

ANNEXURE REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (d) OF UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 5930 DUE FOR ANSWER ON 31-8
IN THE LOK SABHA.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HIGH LEVEL COMMITTEE ON LONG TERM GRAIN POLICY, IN ITS INTERIM REPORT

(I) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMMEDIATE-RUN

(1) Statutory levies imposed on purchase of food grains amount to as much as 12.5 per cent of the procurement price in certain States. The Committee recognizes that payments by the FCI as statutory levies to State Governments are essentially transfers from the Centre to State Governments and should be counted as such. It therefore recommends the elimination of such levies on food grain, an essential commodity. Till such time, the statutory levies charged by States should be settled separately between the Centre and the State Governments without involving FCI or its economic cost. This would require necessary amendments in the States` Sales Tax Acts. Alternatively, the amounts being implicitly transferred to States from the Central Government in the form of statutory levies may be transferred directly in the form of current transfers.

(2) The Committee notes with concern attempts by various producing State Governments to havethe quality norms for purchase of food grain for the Central Pool relaxed from time to time. Many consuming State Governments have refused to accept such food grains for PDS distribution. The Committee therefore recommends that FAQ norms be strictly adhered to. If any State Government requests for relaxation of quality norms, this should be invariably accompanied by an appropriate price reduction besides exemption from statutory state levies.

(3) The MSP for paddy and the levy price for rice be fixed only for a single grade, as against Common and Grade `A` at present.

(4) OMSS prices should cover not only the acquisition cost but also, as far as possible,reflect fully the differences in costs of transport and storage at different points of sale. This should be at least FCI`s acquisition cost less statutory levies. Further, differentials across regions should be restored, and there should be a pre-announced graded escalation per quarter.

(5) In order to revive the offtake from PDS system, the APL population needs to brought into the net by reducing the APL price to 80%

of the economic cost, excluding statutory levies or about 75% of the present economic cost including levies. The BPL price should be 50% of the economic cost, excluding the statutory levies. This would help improve the viability of the distribution network and thus improve BPL offtake as well.

(6) For the BPL families, the quota should depend on the number of members in a family. The Committee recommends that each BPL family be permitted to purchase up to 5 kg per person at the announced BPL price per month or an allocation of 20 kg per family whichever is higher. Any additional requirement may be provided at the APL price.

(7) For the areas covered earlier under the Revamped PDS (1775 blocks), and areas currentlydrought affected or ravaged by other natural calamity like floods, cyclones, earthquakes, etc., a universal PDS be introduced at BPL prices and quota.

(8) In the Revamped PDS areas, the Supplementary Nutrition Programme (SNP) of ICDS maybe strengthened. Similarly, the Midday Meal Scheme could be strengthened by extending its coverage to secondary school students.

(9) The Committee strongly urges the Government to examine ways of expanding programmes of employment generation to create an effective demand for food grains.

(i) Ideally, a massive food for work type programs should be launched. The primary responsibility of launching these programs should rest with Ministry of Rural Development.

(ii) There may however be practical implementation problems in making payments in kind. In these cases, employment provisions with wage payments in cash may be increased simultaneously with an expansion in PDS supplies and strengthening of PDS network.

(iii) The existing restriction on employment in the Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) to BPLcardholders alone should be removed immediately.

To facilitate speedier implementation of food for work schemes, an interim allocation of 2 to 3 million tonnes of food grains may be made available to the States at discounted BPL price.The main objective should be to supplement / amplify schemes currently undertaken by the States such as PM`s Sarak Rozgar Yojana.

(II) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LONG-RUN

(1) The MSP should be announced before the sowing season on the basis of C2 cost ofproduction (i.e., all costs including the imputed costs of family labour, owned capital, and rental on owned land) on the recommendations of the CACP. At this price the Central Government should undertake open ended purchase of FAQ of grains to assure growers an adequate return on their cost.

(2) The Central Government may purchase above MSP in situations where market conditionswarrant to make up any shortages in normative buffer stocks and to meet PDS requirements.This price should be determined by the FCI on the basis of market assessment in each year. And this should not form the basis of MSP for the next year.

(3) The Central Government should instruct its procuring agencies/ State Governments toextend their MSP operations more effectively to States / regions, such as Assam, Bihar, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh, where farmers have reported to have been receiving prices below MSP.

(4) There is a need for immediate action to reduce taxation on essential food items and to minimize barriers to private trade.

(5) OMSS should not distort markets by selling grains at heavily subsidized prices.The minimum price for OMSS should not be below the acquisition cost of FCI less statutory leviewith additions for transport and storage costs in different regions and at different times of the year.

(6) system of exports and imports of food grains should be based on a system of variable tariffs which should replace quotas. This is required for stabilization of prices in an open economy. Also, as far as possible, releases for exports from public stocks should be on best commercial terms.

(7) entralisation of the food grain procurement and distribution system is desirable provided this is seen as a means by which States can be given greater flexibility in design of their PDS and the FCI be given greater incentive for cost control, without the Central Government diluting its commitment to the requirements of price stabilization and food security.

(8) principle, the Committee believes that dual / multiple prices in the PDS are distortionary and provide scope for leakages.

(9) The basic approach of the Committee is that barriers to trade in the grain market should be removed so as to make it more integrated nationally. The role of public intervention should primarily be to stabilize prices and that any system of price stabilization must be national in scope. Also, decentralization will be acceptable to the States only if this is carried outin a manner which does not involve the Centre passing on to them the fiscal costs that it bears currently. The Committee will elaborate on the above-mentioned issues in its final report.